

All Rationals Occur as Exponents

PETER FRANKL

C.N.R.S., Paris, 15 Quai Anatole France, 75007, Paris, France

Communicated by the Managing Editors

Received July 3, 1985

For integers $n \geq k \geq 1$ and $L \subset \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, $m(n, k, L)$ denotes the maximum number of k -subsets of an n -set so that the size of the intersection of any two among them is in L . It is proven that for every rational number $r \geq 1$ there is a choice of k and L so that $cn^r < m(n, k, L) < dn^r$, where c, d depend on k and L but not on n . © 1986 Academic Press, Inc.

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose $n \geq k \geq 1$, $L \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$. Let X be a finite set, $|X| = n$. A family \mathcal{F} of subsets of X is called an L -system if for any two distinct members F, F' of \mathcal{F} one has $|F \cap F'| \in L$. Define

$$m(n, L) = \{\max |\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{F} \text{ is an } L\text{-system}\};$$

$$m(n, k, L) = \{\max |\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{F} \text{ is an } L\text{-system and } |F| = k \text{ for all } F \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

There is a wide variety of problems related to $m(n, L)$ and $m(n, k, L)$. For example, $m(n, k, \{0, 1, \dots, t-1\}) \leq \binom{n}{t} / \binom{k}{t}$ with equality holding if and only if a (n, k, t) -Steiner-system exists. This already shows that the determination of these functions is hopeless in general. Let us mention three general upper bounds:

$$(1) \quad m(n, L) \leq \sum_{0 \leq i \leq |L|} \binom{n}{i} \quad [13]$$

$$(2) \quad m(n, k, L) \leq \binom{n}{|L|} \quad [12]$$

$$(3) \quad m(n, k, L) \leq \prod_{l \in L} (n-l)/(k-l) \text{ for } n > n_0(k) \quad [1].$$

Let us mention some of the recent papers concerning $m(n, L)$ and $m(n, k, L)$: [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14].

Let us use the notation $m(n, k, L) = \Theta(n^\alpha)$ to denote that there exist constants c, d depending on k and L but not on n so that $cn^\alpha < m(n, k, L) < dn^\alpha$. It is not known whether such an α exists for all choices of k and L . However, if $\alpha = \alpha(k, L)$ exists then obviously $\alpha \geq 1$.

THEOREM 1.1. *For every rational number $r, r \geq 1$ there exists k and L so that $m(n, k, L) = \Theta(n^r)$.*

The author has examined all cases with $k \leq 10$ and proved the existence of $\alpha(k, L)$. Actually $\alpha(k, L)$ is an integer for all cases with $k \leq 9$ and all but two cases with $k = 10$. Its value in the exceptional cases is $\frac{5}{2}$. In fact Theorem 1.1 follows from the following result.

THEOREM 1.2. *Suppose that $s, d, a_0, a_1, \dots, a_d$ are non-negative integers with $s \geq d \geq 1, a_d \geq 1$, and $a_1 > \sum_{i \neq 1} a_i \binom{s-1}{i}$, define $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d a_i \binom{x}{i}$. Then*

$$m(n, p(s), \{p(0), \dots, p(s-1)\}) = \Theta(n^{s/d}).$$

2. SOME PREPARATIONS

A family \mathcal{A} of sets is called *closed under intersection* (or shortly *closed*) if $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$ implies $A \cap A' \in \mathcal{A}$. Clearly, to every family \mathcal{B} there is a smallest closed family $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ with $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{B}}$, $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ is called the *closure* of \mathcal{B} .

For an arbitrary set D , the family $\bar{\mathcal{B}}|_D = \{B \cap D : B \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}\}$ is closed again.

By a simple averaging argument (cf. [3]) every $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{X}{k}$ contains a subfamily \mathcal{F}' , $|\mathcal{F}'|/|\mathcal{F}| \geq k!/k^k$ and \mathcal{F}' being k -partite, i.e., there exist disjoint sets X_1, \dots, X_k satisfying $|F \cap X_i| = 1$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}'$ and $i = 1, \dots, k$.

For a set G satisfying $|G \cap X_i| \leq 1$ define the *canonical projection* $\pi(G)$ of G by $\pi(G) = \{i : |G \cap X_i| = 1\}$. Note that $|G| = |\pi(G)|$. Also, if \mathcal{A} is an arbitrary family and G as above, then the families $\mathcal{A}|_G$ and $\pi(\mathcal{A}|_G) = \{\pi(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}|_G\}$ are isomorphic.

THEOREM 2.1 ([8]). *Suppose \mathcal{F} is an (n, k, L) -system. Then there exists a positive constant $c(k, L)$, independent of n , a closed L -system $\mathcal{A} \subset 2^{\{1, 2, \dots, k\}}$, and $\mathcal{F}^* \subset \mathcal{F}$ so that*

- (i) \mathcal{F}^* is k -partite,
- (ii) $|\mathcal{F}^*| \geq c(k, L) |\mathcal{F}|$,
- (iii) For every $F \in \mathcal{F}^*$ one has $\pi(\mathcal{F}^*_F) = \mathcal{A}$.

Note that (iii) implies that \mathcal{F}^* is an L -system, i.e., the size of the intersection of any number of members of \mathcal{F}^* is in L .

Since we are only interested in the order of magnitude of $m(n, k, L)$, we may suppose $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^*$. To express this fact we say that \mathcal{F} is *canonical*, we call \mathcal{A} the *intersection pattern* of \mathcal{F} .

Let us mention without proof the following easy fact.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Suppose $\{\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m\}$ and $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_m\}$ are two families of sets satisfying for all j and all $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_j \leq m$,*

$$|A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_j}| = |B_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap B_{i_j}|.$$

Then they are isomorphic.

Suppose \mathcal{F} is a canonical family with intersection pattern \mathcal{A} . For $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfying $A \subset B$ and $G \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\pi(G) = A$ define

$$\mathcal{J}_G(A, B) = \{H \in \mathcal{F} : G \subset H, \pi(H) = B\}.$$

We say that B *covers* A if $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \subset B$ but there is no $C \in \mathcal{A}$ with $A \subset C \subset B$.

LEMMA 2.3 (Monotonicity lemma). *Suppose $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy $A \subset B \subset D$, with D covering B , $A \subset C \subset D$ and $C \not\subset B$. Then for all $G, H \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\pi(G) = A$, $\pi(H) = B$, and $G \subset H$ one has*

$$|\mathcal{J}_G(A, C)| \geq |\mathcal{J}_H(B, D)|.$$

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{J}_H(B, D) = \{K_1, \dots, K_s\}$. Let L_i be the unique subset of K_i satisfying $\pi(L_i) = C$ —such L_i exists because $C \subset D = \pi(K_i)$. In view of Theorem 2.1 (iii) $L_i \in \mathcal{F}$ holds.

Since $A \subset C$ and $G \subset H$, $G \subset L_i$ holds. To conclude the proof we must show that the L_i 's are distinct.

Consider $\pi(K_i \cap K_j)$ for $i \neq j$. Since $K_i \neq K_j$, it is a proper subset of D , containing B . As D covers B , $\pi(K_i \cap K_j) = B$ follows. Thus $K_i \cap K_j = H$. Consequently $L_i \cap L_j \subseteq H$. But $\pi(L_i) = \pi(L_j) = C$ and $C \not\subset \pi(H) = B$ proving $L_i \neq L_j$. ■

3. THE LOWER BOUND IN THEOREM 1.2

The construction we use here was given in [4]. Since we need it in the proof of the upper bound, we repeat it shortly.

Let b be an integer and Z a set of cardinality $a_0 + a_1 b + a_2 \binom{b}{2} + \dots + a_d \binom{b}{d}$ which we consider as the disjoint union of a_i copies of $([1, b])$, $i = 0, \dots, d$. For $A \subseteq [1, b]$, let $\varphi(A)$ be the corresponding subset of Z

with $|\varphi(A)| = \sum_{i=0}^d a_i \binom{|A|}{i}$. It is very easy to check that for $A, B \subseteq [1, b]$, $\varphi(A \cap B) = \varphi(A) \cap \varphi(B)$ holds. Thus for s arbitrary the family $\{\varphi(A) : A \subseteq [1, b], |A| \leq s\}$ is a closed $\{p(0), \dots, p(s-1)\}$ -system showing $m(p(b), p(s), \{p(0), \dots, p(s-1)\}) \geq \binom{b}{s}$. By choosing $b = \Omega(n^{1/a})$ the desired lower bound follows.

4. PROOF OF THE UPPER BOUND PART OF THEOREM 1.2

W.l.o.g. let \mathcal{F} be a canonical closed L -system, $L = \{p(0), \dots, p(s-1)\}$, let \mathcal{A} be the sample family on $[1, p(s)]$. Also, let $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^{(s)}$ be the sample family from our construction (the point set Y of $\mathcal{P}^{(s)}$ is the disjoint union of a_0 copies of the singleton $\binom{[1, s]}{0}$, a_1 copies of $\binom{[1, s]}{1}$, ..., a_d copies of $\binom{[1, s]}{d}$), say

$$Y = \bigcup_{i=0}^d \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq a_i} Y_{a_i}^j.$$

For a subset $B \subseteq [1, s]$ denote by $\rho(B)$ the subset of size $p(|B|)$ of Y which is the union of the corresponding subsets of $Y_{a_i}^j$. Then

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\rho(B) : B \subseteq [1, s]\}.$$

Note that as a lattice \mathcal{P} is isomorphic to $A^{[1, s]}$, in particular, all maximal chains have the same size s .

We are going to show that \mathcal{A} can be embedded into \mathcal{P} , that is, there exists a 1-1 map $\varphi: [1, p(s)] \rightarrow Y$ so that $\varphi(A) \in \mathcal{P}$ holds for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

Call a subset $C \subseteq [1, p(s)]$ an *atom* if $C \cap A \neq \emptyset$ implies $C \subseteq A$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. An element $x \in A \in \mathcal{A}$ is a *generic point* for A if for all $B \in \mathcal{A}$, $x \in B$ implies $A \subseteq B$.

Note that if C is an atom, $|C| = a_1$, then $\mathcal{A} \cup \{C\}$ will be a closed family. Adding atoms of size a_1 successively one obtains finally a family \mathcal{A}' to which one cannot add atoms of size a_1 . When proving the imbeddability we may assume $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}'$.

Call a set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $|A| = p(i)$ *filled* if it contains i atoms of size a_1 . For a filled set let $D(A)$ be the union of its atoms, $|D(A)| = ia_1$.

CLAIM 4.1. *All $A \in \mathcal{A}$ are filled.*

Proof of Claim 4.1. The claim clearly holds if $|A| = a_1$. Let A be a counterexample of minimal size $|A| = p(i)$. Set $\mathcal{B} = \{B \in \mathcal{A}, B \subsetneq A\}$.

Define $M = M(A) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$. Since $A - M$ is an atom,

$$|A - M| < a_1 \text{ holds.}$$

Define also,

$$K = K(A) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} D(B).$$

Then $K \subset M$, K is the union of atoms of size a_1 , thus

$$|K| = ja_1 \quad \text{holds with some } j < i.$$

For definiteness let C_1, \dots, C_j be these atoms. For $B \in \mathcal{B}$ define $T(B) = \{v: C_v \subset B\}$. Since B is filled, $|T(B)| = \lfloor |B|/a_1 \rfloor$ holds. If for $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$, $|T(B) \cap T(B')| = t$ then $ta_1 \leq |B \cap B'| \leq ta_1 + |B - D(B)| < (t+1)a_1$ holds. Therefore $|B \cap B'| = p(i)$.

Consequently, the map $B \rightarrow \rho(T(B))$ defines an embedding of \mathcal{B} into $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}$ (here we used Proposition 2.2). In particular

$$|M| = \left| \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B \right| \leq \left| \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}^{(j)}} P \right| = p(j). \quad (1)$$

Thus $p(i) = |A| < p(j) + a_1 < p(i)$, a contradiction. ■

Applying the claim to $[1, p(s)] \in \mathcal{A}$, we see that there are s atoms C_1, \dots, C_s of size a_1 in it. Define for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $T(A) = \{v: C_v \subset A\}$. Then $A \rightarrow \rho(T(A))$ gives the desired embedding of \mathcal{A} into $\mathcal{P}^{(s)}$.

Note that this implies that every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $|A| = p(d)$ has a generic point (no $B \in \mathcal{A}$ with $B \subsetneq A$ can contain elements which are mapped on a copy of $([1, s])$). In particular, if $s = d$, then $|\mathcal{F}| \leq n$ follows and this will be the starting case of the induction.

Also, we can add to \mathcal{F} all subsets of members of \mathcal{F} which have projection in \mathcal{P} , i.e., the family

$$\mathcal{H} = \{H: \pi(H) \in \mathcal{P}, \exists F \in \mathcal{F}, H \subseteq F\}$$

is still closed.

Suppose $s > d$ and the upper bound is proved for $s-1$. Define

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = \{H \in \mathcal{H}: |H| = p(s-1)\}.$$

By induction

$$(4) \quad |\mathcal{H}_1| \leq \Omega(n^{(s-1)/d}) \text{ holds.}$$

Set $\mathcal{H}_0^{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{H}_1^{(0)} = \mathcal{H}_1$. If $\mathcal{H}_0^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{H}_1^{(i)}$ are defined and some member $G \in \mathcal{H}_1^{(i)}$ is contained in less than $n^{1/d}$ members of $\mathcal{H}_0^{(i)}$ then define $\mathcal{H}_1^{(i+1)} = \mathcal{H}_1^{(i)} - \{G\}$, $\mathcal{H}_0^{(i+1)} = \{H \in \mathcal{H}_0^{(i)}: G \subset H\}$ and continue. In view of (4) altogether less than $n^{1/d} O(n^{(s-1)/d}) = O(n^{s/d})$ sets are thrown away. Thus

it will be sufficient to prove the upper bound for the remaining family, which we denote, by abuse of notation, by \mathcal{F} . Define

$$\mathcal{H}_i = \{H \in \mathcal{H} : |H| = p(s-i)\}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq s.$$

CLAIM 4.2. Suppose $G \in \mathcal{H}_i$, $i > 0$, $A, C \in \mathcal{P}$, $\pi(G) = A \subset C$, $|C| = p(s-i+1)$. Then $|\mathcal{J}_G(A, C)| \geq n^{1/d}$.

Proof. Apply induction on i . The case $i = 1$ is fine by the construction. Let $A_0(C_0)$ be the subset of $[1, s]$ satisfying $\varphi(A_0) = A$ ($\varphi(C_0) = C$), respectively. Of course, $|A_0| = |C_0| - 1 = s - i$. Let j be an arbitrary element of $[1, s] - C_0$. Define $B = \varphi(A_0 \cup \{j\})$, $D = \varphi(C_0 \cup \{j\})$. Take $G, H \in \mathcal{H}$ with $G \subset H$, $\pi(G) = A$, $\pi(H) = B$. By the induction hypothesis and by Lemma 2.3 we have

$$|\mathcal{J}_G(A, C)| \geq |\mathcal{J}_H(B, D)| \geq n^{1/d}. \quad \blacksquare$$

CLAIM 4.3. For $1 \leq i \leq s-1$ one has $|\mathcal{H}_i| \leq (s/\binom{s}{i}) |\mathcal{H}_1| n^{-(i-1)/d}$.

Proof. The statement is trivial for $i = 1$. Suppose it has been proved for $i-1$. Consider the bipartite graph with vertex set $\mathcal{H}_i, \mathcal{H}_{i-1}$ with (G, H) forming an edge if $G \in \mathcal{H}_i$, $H \in \mathcal{H}_{i-1}$, and $G \subset H$. Now the degree of H is $s-i+1$ while the degree of G is at least $in^{1/d}$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{H}_i| &\leq \frac{s-i+1}{i} n^{-1/d} |\mathcal{H}_{i-1}| \leq |\mathcal{H}_1| \frac{\binom{s}{i-1} s-i+1}{s} \frac{1}{i} n^{-(i-1)/d} \\ &= |\mathcal{H}_1| \frac{\binom{s}{i}}{s} n^{-(i-1)/d}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the upper bound is immediate: for an arbitrary $F \in \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}_0$ let $A_1(F), \dots, A_s(F)$ be the s atoms in F , i.e., $\pi(A_i(F)) = \varphi(\{i\})$. Then no other member F' of \mathcal{F} contains $A_1(F), \dots, A_s(F)$ because otherwise $|F \cap F'| \geq sa_1 > p(s-1)$, a contradiction. Consequently,

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{|\mathcal{H}_{s-1}|}{s} = O(n^{s/d}). \quad \blacksquare$$

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

First of all let us mention an old conjecture of Erdős and Simonovits which has an apparent similarity with Theorem 1.1.

For a class \mathcal{C} of graphs let $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{C})$ denote the maximum number of edges in a graph with no subgraphs isomorphic to a member of \mathcal{C} .

Conjecture 5.1 [2]. For every rational number r , $1 < r < 2$, there exists a finite class \mathcal{C} of bipartite graphs so that $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{C}) = \Theta(n^r)$ holds.

Suppose $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d a_i \binom{x}{i}$, where $a_d \geq 1$, a_i is integer for $i=0, \dots, d-1$. Then there exists a smallest non-negative integer $t=t(p)$ so that substituting $y=x-t$ into $p(x)$ will give a polynomial $q(y) = p(y+t) = \sum_{i=0}^t b_i \binom{y}{i}$ with $b_d = a_d$ and $b_i \geq 0$, integer.

Conjecture 5.2. Suppose $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d a_i \binom{x}{i}$ and $t=t(p)$ are as above. Then for $s \geq s_0(p)$ one has

$$m(n, p(s), \{p(j): 0 < j < s\}) = \Theta(n^{(s-t)/d}).$$

We can prove the above conjecture in several special cases not covered by Theorem 1.2 and can obtain as well a general upper bound of the form $O(n^{a(p)+s/d})$, where $a(p)$ is a constant depending only on the polynomial p .

REFERENCES

1. M. DEZA, P. ERDŐS, AND P. FRANKL, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **36** (1978), 369–384.
2. P. ERDŐS, On the combinatorial problems which I would most like to see solved, *Combinatorica* **1** (1981), 25–42.
3. P. ERDŐS AND D. J. KLEITMAN, Coloring graphs to maximize the proportion of multicolored k -edges, *J. Combin. Theory* **5** (1968), 164–169.
4. P. FRANKL, Constructing finite sets with given intersection, *Ann. Discrete Math.* **17** (1983), 289–291.
5. P. FRANKL, Families of finite sets with three intersections, *Combinatorica* **4** (1984), 141–148.
6. P. FRANKL AND Z. FÜREDI, On hypergraphs without two edges intersecting in a given number of vertices, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **36** (1984), 230–236.
7. P. FRANKL AND Z. FÜREDI, Forbidding just one intersection, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **39** (1985), 160–176.
8. Z. FÜREDI, On finite set-systems whose every intersection is a kernel of a star, *Discrete Math.* **47** (1983), 129–132.
9. Z. FÜREDI, Families of finite sets with 3 intersections, *Combinatorica*, in press.
10. L. PYBER, An extension of a Frankl–Füredi theorem, *Discrete Math.* **52** (1984), 253–268.
11. V. RÖDL, A packing and covering problem, *European J. Combin.* **6** (1985), 69–78.
12. D. K. RAY-CHAUDHURI AND R. M. WILSON, On t -designs, *Osaka J. Math.* **12** (1975), 737–744.
13. P. FRANKL AND R. M. WILSON, Intersection theorems with geometric consequences, *Combinatorica* **1** (1981), 357–368.
14. P. FRANKL AND V. RÖDL, Forbidden intersections, *Transactions AMS*, in press.